

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 28-29 have been amended to clarify that the polarizing plate is an optical layer, claim 30 has been amended to clarify that the adhesive layer is exposed on the surface of the optical member, and claim 32 has been amended to clarify that the transparent protective film is provided on a side of the polarizer.

It is submitted that these changes are minor and immediate, so that they do not raise any new issues. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

As a preliminary, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the personal interview which was held on November 10, 2004.

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-12, 16-20, and 28-33 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical film. Independent claims 13-15, and 21-27 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a liquid crystal display.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to. It is alleged that the expression "at least one other optical layer" is confusing because "no optical layer has been recited in previous claims".

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested. It is understood that the objection is directed to claims 28-29 which use the expression "at least one other optical layer." Present claims 28-29 recite that the optical member comprises a first optical layer which is the polarizing plate according to claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for

lack of written description. It is alleged in the Office Action that the expression of claim 30 “an exposed surface of the optical member for adhesion with other members” is not disclosed in the original application, and that the expression “the optical member” lacks antecedent basis.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. The expression used in original claim 13, lines 11-12, i.e., that the adhesive layer is “exposed on the surface” of the optical member, has been used in claim 30, except that “the surface” has been changed to “a surface”. It is submitted that the embodiment of claim 30 is fully described and illustrated in the original specification.

Further, the lack of antecedent basis objection is respectfully traversed. The preamble of claim 30 recites an optical member, so that the expression “the optical member” necessarily refers to this element.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-7, 11, 13-15, 17-20, 22-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 6-59123 (“Yoshimi”), claims 8-10 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,498,633 to Ozeki et al. (“Ozeki”), claims 12, 16, 21, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,088,079 to Kameyama et al. (“Kameyama”), claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,654,085 to Koike et al. (“Koike”), and claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshimi in view of US 6,094,245 to Ochi et al. (“Ochi”).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. As discussed during the personal interview, Yoshimi is completely silent regarding a laminate comprising two

polarizer portions. Specifically, in Yoshimi, a conventional polarizing film is laminated on each side of the liquid crystal cell. Any suggestion to the contrary inferred from the unintelligible English machine-translation is erroneous, as would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art by reference to a correct translation of Yoshimi. Applicants have proposed an English translation of paragraph [0005] of Yoshimi in the previous response. Following the personal interview, it is noted that the Examiner will obtain and refer to a full English translation of Yoshimi.

In summary, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 13-15 and the claims dependent thereon. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited combinations of references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020582

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep